

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 7-14 are now in the application. Claims 7, 11, and 12 have been amended. New dependent claim 14 has been added to further define the scope of the present invention.

Support for the subject matter of new claim 14 may be found in the description of the present invention on page 2, line 23 to page 4, line 17 of the instant specification.

In the first paragraph under "Drawings" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a), because the drawings do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

More specifically, the Examiner alleges that the contact piece recited in claims 12 and 13 is not shown in the drawings.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion for reasons as discussed hereinbelow.

The contact pieces (9) recited in claims 12 and 13 are illustrated in the drawings as shown in Fig. 2 on the drawings of the instant application. The movable contact pieces are illustrated by reference numeral 9. A mechanical connection to the blocking lever 4 is illustrated by the broken full line. The movable contact piece 9

cooperates with a stationary contact piece (by virtue of a contact hook at the upper end of the circuit path). The corresponding description of this feature is on page 8, lines 12-15 of the instant specification.

Therefore, applicant requests that the Examiner's objection the drawings be withdrawn because the contact piece is shown in Fig. 2 as discussed above.

In item 2 under Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112 on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 7 has been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

More specifically, the Examiner states in item 3 that the phrase “blocking devices has become effective” is unclear, particularly the term “effective” is indefinite.

Applicant has amended claim 7 herewith by reciting that “said blocking device being operational” thereby avoiding use of the objected to term.

Support for these changes may be found in the functional description of the operation of blocking device on page 8, line 21 – page 9, line 27 of the specification of the instant application.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The above noted changes to claim 7 are provided solely for clarification or cosmetic reasons.

In item 4 under Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 7-13 have been rejected as being anticipated by Peek et al. (US 2,790,095) (hereinafter “Peek”) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and, therefore, the original claims have not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful. Claim 7 calls for, *inter alia*, a drive device, having:

a rotatable input shaft and a rotatable output shaft;

a magnetic coupling connecting the input shaft and the output shaft, the magnetic coupling having at least two magnet pairs;

a blocking device disposed to limit a rotatability of the output shaft in a first direction of rotation and the blocking device being operational, and as a function of magnetic forces emanating from said magnetic coupling, to cause the output shaft to rotate in a second direction of rotation opposite to the first direction of rotation. (emphasis added)

Claim 7 of the instant application recites, *inter alia*, a rotatable input shaft and a rotatable output shaft wherein the output shaft is rotated in a second direction of rotation opposite to the first direction of rotation (of the input shaft). This reversal of

movement occurs because of the use of a blocking device (for example, the device 10 in Fig. 2 of the instant drawings) and the correspondingly acting magnetic coupling as described on page 8, line 5 to page 9, line 34 of the instant specification.

The Peek reference discloses a device for converting a rotational movement into reciprocating movement. In Fig. 1 of Peek, a first rotational mechanism 1 is provided, the movement of which is transferred onto a mechanism 2, which performs a reciprocating movement (see column 1, lines 47-52). The mechanism 1 includes a magnetic circuit 3, which has magnets arranged in circles. The mechanism 2 has a magnetic circle 4 of the similar type. When the mechanism 1 rotates, the magnet poles of the magnetic circuit 3 rotate before the magnet poles of the magnetic circuit 4. A rotation of the mechanism 2 is prevented by tangential springs 6. Due to the rotation of the mechanism 1 and the fixation of the mechanism 2, pulling and repulsive forces act between the magnetic circuits 3 and 4, so that a reciprocating movement of the mechanism 2 is produced (see column 1, lines 55-69).

Figs. 2 and 2a of Peek show alternative embodiments, wherein a rotational movement of the magnetic circuit 4 is blocked by a rotation - preventing diaphragm 7 (see column 2, lines 7-16). Peek discloses in column 2, lines 2-6, that the embodiments of Figs. 2 and 2a, as well as Fig 1, can be used for pumps.

Peek discloses (see column 2, lines 16-24) two magnetic circuits 8, 10, which are rigidly connected with the mechanism 1, that are axially spaced apart from one another. In the intermediate space between the two magnetic circuits 8, 10, an

axially movable circuit 9 is arranged, which is connected with the mechanism 2.

Even this embodiment converts a rotational movement of the mechanism 1 into a reciprocating movement of the mechanism 2. Peek describes in column 2, lines 46-52 that one of the two mechanisms may perform both forms of movement. For example, this may happen if one of the two mechanisms is completely blocked. Insofar, the example of to Fig. 3 either represents a transfer of a rotational movement into a reciprocating movement, or one of the mechanisms rests while the other mechanism performs either a rotational movement as well as a reciprocating movement. Therefore, Peek discloses either a rotatable input shaft or a reciprocating output shaft, or a rotatable input shaft and a blocked output shaft. Therefore, it is not apparent from or suggested by Peek that both the input shaft and the output shaft are rotatable as recited in the claims of the instant application..

Peek discloses in Fig. 4 (see column 2, lines 70-73 and column 3, lines 1-5) that a rotational movement of a mechanism 1 is converted into a reciprocating movement. As described in column 3, lines 13-17, the mechanism 2 is protected against a rotational movement not only by the rotation-preventing diaphragm 7 but also by a stationary cylindrical magnetic circuit 15. Thus, Fig. 4 only teaches to convert a rotational movement into a reciprocating movement. In the embodiment shown in Fig. 5, a mechanism 1 has a winding 19. The winding 19 is part of a sucking magnet 20. The magnetic circuits 12, 13 are connected with the sucking magnet 20 to have rigid angles. When applying current to the winding 19 of the mechanism, a simultaneous reciprocating and a rotational movement is produced at the mechanism 2 (see column 3, lines 19-35). The application of current occurs in an

alternating manner so that the mechanism 20 while being supported by a spring 21 in the direction of the sucking magnet 20 is moved away from the sucking magnet 20. In this case, a magnetic circuit 14 is moved through the magnetic circuits 12, 13, which are fastened to the sucking magnet 20, so that the mechanism 2 performs a reciprocating movement.

The mechanism 1 thus remains at rest while the mechanism 2 of Fig. 5 simultaneously performs a rotational movement, as well as a reciprocating movement.

According to claim 7 of the instant application¹, there is provided a rotatable input shaft and a rotatable output shaft, which are connected with each other by a magnetic coupling connection. The direction of movement is reversed by a blocking device after an abutment of the output shaft against the blocking device, so that the output shaft is moved in a rotational direction opposite to the first direction.

Thus, according to the present claimed invention the input shaft, as well as the output shaft, are mounted to rotate. A rotational movement of the input shaft is first performed in a first direction. After abutment of the output shaft against the blocking device, the rotational movement is reversed and the output shaft rotates opposite to the first direction.

Peek discloses a conversion of a rotational movement into a reciprocating movement so that there is no drive which transfers a rotational movement into a rotational movement as recited in the instant claims. In accordance with the embodiment of

Fig. 3, also a conversion of a rotational movement into a reciprocating movement is provided. If necessary, when the mechanism 2 is blocked, the mechanism 1 can perform a rotational movement as well as a reciprocating movement. The embodiment according to Fig. 4 also provides that a rotational movement of a mechanism 1 is converted into a reciprocating movement of a mechanism 2. According to the embodiment of Fig. 5, a resting mechanism having a sucking magnet 20 is acted upon by alternating current so that a reciprocating movement is produced at a mechanism 2. The mechanism 1 (input) remains completely at rest in this case. Merely the mechanism 2 performs a reciprocating movement and, due to the interaction of the magnetic circuits 12, 13 and 14, a rotation is additionally transmitted onto the mechanism 2.

Similarly, the claims in Peek do not provide any relevant disclosure beyond the description of the embodiments as discussed above. Claim 1 of Peek recites that a rotational movement of the second member is prevented so that, according to the pre-characterizing clause of claim 1, a conversion of a rotational movement into a reciprocating movement or vice versa occurs. In claim 4 of Peek, a special configuration of the coupling for converting a continuous rotational movement into a reciprocating movement or vice versa is provided to produce a rotational movement of one of the mechanisms into a reciprocating movement of the other mechanism.

Thus, it is apparent that Peek discloses the conversion of a rotational movement into a reciprocating movement.

To the contrary, the present claimed invention makes transfer or converts a rotational movement into a rotational movement, in which magnetic forces are used to modify the form of movement. Driving movement and output movement are each rotating movements. The output movement is not a reciprocating movement.

Clearly, Peek does not show a **"a blocking device disposed to limit a rotatability of said output shaft in a first direction of rotation and said blocking device being operational, and as a function of magnetic forces emanating from said magnetic coupling, to cause said output shaft to rotate in a second direction of rotation opposite to the first direction of rotation"** as recited in claim 7 of the instant application. Independent method claim 11 contains similar limitations. Moreover, dependent claim 14 recites that "said output shaft when operational only rotates in a second direction of rotation opposite to the first direction of rotation" which is not disclosed in Peek.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that the Peek reference does not show or suggest the features of claim 7 or claim 11. Claims 7 and 11 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 7 or 11 and further with respect to claim 14 as discussed above.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 7-13 are solicited.

Appl. No. 10/593,122
Amdt. dated 1/7/09
Reply to Office action of 10/16/08

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/F. Donald Paris/
F. Donald Paris
Reg. No. 24,054

FDP/lq

January 7, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101